



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

(Riecker's values were obtained under poor conditions; some of the Cornell results are based upon too few series to be finally indicative.)

(4) Such an analytical composition of the total psychometric function can not be determined by inspection.

(5) While we do not wish to generalize beyond our few cases, we conclude that mathematical analysis does, in our cases, indicate the operation of two antagonistic factors, and that such a solution suggests a dispositional or impressional account of the paradoxical error.

(6) In view of this conclusion we suggest that the $\Phi(\gamma)$ -hypothesis should not be applied to the problem of the two-point limen except in the light of a preliminary analysis.¹²

¹² A strong tendency toward the paradoxical error is easily demonstrable by the application of a single point. *B*, working with knowledge, reported 'two' (and 'three' and 'four'!) impressions for the single point. We were not able to discover any qualitative difference between these multiple perceptions and those obtained with wide separations.

ERRATUM

In the first part of the Checking Table facing p. 120 above, for $p = .44$, $X = O$, the value .8866 should be .8860. This correction has been made in the offprinted copies of the Table.